

EXHIBIT 3

1 Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
2 attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
3 from discovery.

4
5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 169:**

6 All minutes of meetings of UBER’s Board of Directors, or any committee thereof, during
7 which OTTOMOTTO, OTTO TRUCKING, or LEVANDOWSKI was discussed.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 169:**

9 Defendants will produce non-privileged Board of Directors meeting minutes responsive to
10 this Request located through a reasonably diligent search.

11 Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
12 attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
13 from discovery.

14
15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 170:**

16 All DOCUMENTS REGARDING LiDAR that were prepared for or received by any of
17 DEFENDANTS’ Board of Directors, or any committee thereof.

18 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 170:**

19 Defendants will produce non-privileged DOCUMENTS that were sent or presented to
20 Uber’s Board of Directors or any committee thereof responsive to this Request, if any, located
21 through a reasonably diligent search.

22 Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
24 from discovery. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that the term
25 “REGARDING” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 171:

All DOCUMENTS REGARDING OTTOMOTTO, OTTO TRUCKING, or
LEVANDOWSKI that were prepared for or received by UBER’s Board of Directors, or any
committee thereof.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 171:

Defendants will produce non-privileged DOCUMENTS that were sent or presented to
Uber’s Board of Directors or any committee thereof responsive to this Request, if any, located
through a reasonably diligent search.

Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
from discovery. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that the term
“REGARDING” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Request.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]